

Agency Docket:  
920584-906003

**BARNES & THORNBURG**

P.O. Box 2786  
Chicago, IL 60690-2786  
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION  
TO: (703) 746-7238

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 14 2003

DATE: October 13, 2003

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER PAGE: 5

TO: **HONORABLE DIRECTOR OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS**

EXAMINER: Marlon B. Johnson

GROUP ART UNIT: 2153

ATTN **Examiner**

MAIL STOP **After Final: Responses No Fee**

Attached: Response To Office Action Of August 12, 2003

If you do not receive all pages, please contact William M. Lee, Jr. at (312) 214-4800 or his assistant, Jennifer Ramirez at (312) 214-4829.

**Certificate of Transmission**

I hereby certify that this paper for Serial No. 09/520,853 facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office, Fax Number (703) 746-7238 on the date shown below.

Jennifer J. Ramirez

Name of Person Signing

Signature

October 13, 2003

Mail Stop: AF

920584-906003

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN RE THE APPLICATION OF

Michael O'Doherty

SERIAL NO. 09/520,853

FILED: 7 March 2000

FOR: Improved Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)

) Examiner: Johnson, Marlon B

) Group Art Unit No. 2153

) Customer number: 23644

**OFFICIAL****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
transmitted to the above - identified examiner at the  
United States Patent and Trademark Office (703) 746-  
7238 on October 13, 2003  
Name of person signing: Jennifer J. Ramirez  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

OCT 14 2003

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF 12 AUGUST 2003**

Honorable Director of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir

In response to the Office Action of 12 August 2003, the following remarks are made.

**Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103**

In response to the office action dated 5 March 2003, all the independent claims were amended to recite that computer software code is stored in a SIP message as described for example on page 2 of the description at lines 18 to 20. Applicant notes that the Examiner appears to have overlooked these amendments when formulating some parts of the office action, but has considered these amendments in others. Since the applicant's previous amendments have not been considered, the applicant requests withdrawal of the final rejection, as it is premature.

In section 2 of the office action, the Examiner considers *Arnold et al*, and lists the features of claim 1 as it was before the amendments submitted with Applicant's response of 4 June